REMARKS

This Amendment serves as the submission for the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) which is being filed herewith. Applicant's arguments to the rejections of the earlier final Office Action are provided below to further describe how the newly amended claims are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 26 and 27 are new. Claim 12 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 12, 15 to 23 and 25 to 27, are now pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of this response.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that the objections to the claims have been withdrawn. Applicants also thank the Examiner for indicating that the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection of claims 12, 15 to 23, and 25, has been withdrawn.

Claims 12, 15 to 17, 20, and 25, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 5,278,955 to Forte et al. ("Forte reference") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,663 to Gleason ("Gleason reference").

The Forte reference appears to concern a system and method allowing users of an OSI mail handling system the advantage of communicating with users of other mail handling systems and utilizing the functionality of the OSI system. Specifically, the Forte reference refers to a method for utilizing an RFC-987 gateway as a means to realize a full Interpersonal Messaging (IPM) capability within a mail handling system. The Forte reference further recites that such a gateway capability coupled with an enhanced mail handler provides the user of the system the ability to process either RFC-822 or IPMs from a common mail queue and a single user interface.

The Gleason reference appears to concern a data communications protocol facilitates communications between a message entry device and a messaging center. According to the Gleason reference, for example, in a two-way data communications between a message entry device and a message handling center, an input message is encoded by encapsulating the message between first and second delimiters, e.g., "{" and "}", and associating a message tag with the encapsulated message. In this example, both the message tag and the encapsulated message are recited to be in human-readable ASCII format, and the delimited message and associated message tag are further encapsulated by additional delimiters to form a protocol data unit with an associated protocol data unit tag.

Claim 12, from which claims 15 to 17 and 20 depend, is directed to a method for transmitting information including using a data structure defined by Abstract Syntax Notation One, transmitting the information encoded as text (even as plain text

as according to claim 13), *the encoded text being decoded without access to an Abstract Syntax Notation One definition internal to an application.*

The Forte and Gleason references are not believed to teach the present invention. Further, the two references, alone or in combination, fail to use an ASN.1 data structure, send data via encoded text, and then read such text without accessing any internal definitions. In fact, the references teach using ***other data structures and allowing different transmissions.*** Gleason reference, col. 22, lines 16-19. A mere reference to ASCII text is not sufficient to show the present invention without having the benefit of the present Specification. And, in fact, Applicants respectfully submit that the ***Gleason reference essentially teaches away from ASN.1*** in that, at col. 22, for example, it is stated that "CAP II PDU encoding methodoloty is extremely simple compared with other complicated and expensive encoding/decoding techniques… such as ASN.1."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the references in combination do not teach or describe the present invention, and further, no motivation is apparent which would lead one to combine the Forte (which was filed even just a few months prior to the present invention) and Gleason references at the time of the present invention. Further, in view of this, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention as claimed in claim 12 was not well known at the time of the invention or filing of the invention.

Since claims 15 to 17 and 20 depend from claim 12, those claims also are believed allowable over the Forte and Gleason references. Claim 25 recites features analogous to those of claim 12, and is believed allowable over the Forte and Gleason references for essentially the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12, 15 to 17, 20, and 25, over the Forte reference in view of the Gleason reference.

Claims 18, 19, and 23, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Forte reference in view of the Gleason reference, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,836,008 to Goumillou ("Goumillou reference").

The Forte, Gleason, and Goumillou references do not teach or suggest each of the features of claims 18, 19, and amended 23.

As discussed above, the Forte and Gleason references do not appear to render the present claims 12, 15 to 17 and 20, unpatentable. Likewise, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18 and 19 which depend from claim 12 are allowable over the Forte and Gleason references for at least the same reasons as claim 12. And, claim 23, which recites features analogous to those of claim 12, is also believed

allowable over the Forte and Gleason references for essentially the same reasons as claim 12.

Claim 12 (from which claims 18 and 19 depend) and claim 23 essentially are directed to a method for transmitting information including using a data structure defined by Abstract Syntax Notation One, transmitting the information encoded as text, and decoding the text without accessing an internal definition prescribed by ASN.1.

The tertiary Goumillou reference purportedly concerns a system for transmitting information between a source and a receiver via a network to which is connected telecommunications equipment (comprised of a plurality of interfaces for various communication services) and an interface between the telecommunications equipment and external administration equipment. However, the Goumillou reference alone or in combination with the Forte and Gleason references does not describe or even suggest at least the features of claim 12 involving, among other things, the encoded text decoded without access to an Abstract Syntax Notation One definition internal to an application. As discussed above, it is respectfully believed that, in fact, the Gleason reference teaches away from use of ASN.1. And, the Goumillou reference does not teach each of the further features of the dependent claims 18 and 19.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that the Forte and Goumillou references are not properly combinable since one concerns Interpersonal Messaging system and taking advantage of the OSI system, and the other concerns an interface between equipment and at the same time avoiding any conversion of data structure between the external administration and the internal management of the telecommunications equipment. (Goumillou reference, col. 2, and Abstract).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18, 19, and 23, are allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Forte, Gleason, and Goumillou references is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Forte reference in view of the Gleason reference and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,892,950 to Rigori et al. ("Rigori reference").

As explained above, the Forte and Gleason references do not teach or even suggest the features of claim 12 from which claim 21 depends. The Rigori reference does not cure their deficiencies.

The Rigori reference purportedly concerns an applications programming interface to a telecommunications management network having a command language interpreter and a compiler. The interpreter includes interpreter scripts for converting

the network management parameters between the command string format and a network management protocol compatible format. The compiler compiles interpreter scripts for encoding and decoding user defined parameter types, which are then loaded dynamically to the interpreter.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Forte, Gleason, and Rigori references do not describe or even suggest features of claim 21, as described above. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Forte, Gleason, and Rigori references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of all claims be withdrawn, and that all claims be held allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of all of the above, it is believed that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 12, 15 to 23, and 25, have been obviated, and that all currently pending claims 12, 15 to 23, and 25 to 27, are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn in light of the further clarifications above, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Monday, March 28, 2011

By: /Linda Lecomte/
Linda Lecomte (Reg. No. 47,084)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
1-212-425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646